UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/560,487 | 12/12/2005 | Wolfgang Orgeldinger | SCHO0590 | 3136 |
| 22862 GLENN PATEI | 7590 10/15/201 NT GROUP | EXAMINER | | |
| | WAY, SUITE L | CASTELLANO, STEPHEN J | | |
| MENLO PARK, CA 94025 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3781 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 10/15/2010 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

eptomatters@glenn-law.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| 10/560,487 | ORGELDINGER, WOLFGANG | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | | | |

| | retephen v. eastellaner | 0701 |
|---|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appea | ars on the cover sheet with the d | correspondence address |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>02 September 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS | APPLICATION IN CONDITION F | OR ALLOWANCE. |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on tapplication, applicant must timely file one of the following reapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appear for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CF periods: | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire lat | lvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date o have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exteunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sheet forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | In which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of nortened statutory period for reply origi | 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as |
| 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compli | ance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t | filed within two months of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extensions Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wit AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a |
| 3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further constant. (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | sideration and/or search (see NOT v); | ΓE below); |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bette appeal; and/or | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.11 | | ected claims. |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12.5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324). |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allownon-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, t | imely filed amendment canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 12-14,16 and 17. | | l be entered and an explanation of |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>18-23</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | rercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | al and/or appellant fails to provide a see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attached. |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowance because: |
| 12. 🔲 Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (F | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | |
| 13. X Other: The drawing amendment includes new matter in the supported by applicant's disclosure. | at a specific lattice structure is sho | own which had not been originally |
| | | |
| | /Stephen J. Castellano/ Primary Examiner | |
| | Art I Init: 3781 | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: There is no discernable difference between the claims presented and the previous set of claims of record.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claim 12 states that "the lateral walls of the crate are structured to define a lattice." Applicant states that "nobody would consider a simple hole in a wall surface to make the wall a lattice-structured wall." However, the portions of the specification that support the lattice are found in Fig. 3a and in the written substitute specification on page 11, lines 5-12. There is nothing in the specification which defines the lattice as having more than a single hole. Furthermore, Fig. 3a shows only a single hole for engaging the end of a hook (fastening means 32). It is believed that given the detailed showing of a lattice with only one hole that the examiner had no choice other than to broadly interpret the term "lattice" to include a single hole.